

## **REMARKS**

### **SUMMARY:**

The subject application sets forth claims 1-20, of which claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are independent claims.

The detailed action dated March 11, 2004 set forth several characterizations of the subject application. Such Office Action objects to original claim 18 because of missing punctuation. Original claims 6-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to adequately teach the claimed invention. Original claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Original claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Schmidt ("Wrapper Facade – A Structural Pattern for Encapsulating Functions within Classes"). Original claims 2-4, 7-9, 12-14 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt. Original claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,732,270 (Foody et al.).

Responses to each of the characterizations outlined above, including a traversal of each prior art rejection, will follow in order as presented by the Examiner in the March 11, 2004 Office Action.

### **OBJECTION TO CLAIM 18:**

The March 11, 2004 Office Action objects to original claim 18 because of missing punctuation. More particularly, original claim 18 stands objected to for missing a "." on line 3. In response, currently amended claim 18 is presented and is modified from original claim 18 to add the missing punctuation mark. The original omission of proper

punctuation was an inadvertent typographical error and thus it should be appreciated that the presently submitted amendment to claim 18 is not for any reason other than to correct such typographical error. Additional correction of original typographical errors are also presently submitted for claims 10 and 15. Based on the present amendments and above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claim 18 be reconsidered.

**35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, REJECTIONS (CLAIMS 6-15):**

Original claims 6-15 stand rejected to under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. More particularly, original claims 6 and 11 recite “the component framework” in lines 5 and 6, respectively, and there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. In response, presently amended claims 6 and 11 correct this inadvertent typographical error to refer in such respective claims to “a component framework” as opposed to “the component framework”. This minor wording issue was an inadvertent typographical error and thus it should be appreciated that the presently submitted amendments to respective claims 6 and 11 are not for any reason other than to correct such error.

Based on the present amendments and the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 6 and 11 be reconsidered. Furthermore, since claims 7-10 and 12-15 variously depend from otherwise allowable respective claims 6 and 11, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection of such claims also be reconsidered.

**35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION AND REJECTIONS (CLAIMS 4, 5, 8, 10, 14, 15, 19 AND 20):**

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to adequately teach the claimed invention. More particularly, the specification is objected to as failing to adequately teach the claimed limitation “the at least two objects are address classes” as recited in claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19 and

20. Furthermore, claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In response to the above characterizations, the original specification has been amended to include an inadvertent omission of the word “are” on line 23 of page 12. Applicant submits that this amendment does not add any new matter to the specification. Since such wording was used in the original claims of the application (which according to 37 C.F.R. §1.77 constitutes a part of the original specification of an application), such amendment does not add any new matter to the present application.

The aforementioned amendment to the specification should obviate the original objection to the specification as well as the rejection of claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and acknowledgement of the same is earnestly solicited.

#### **PRIOR ART REJECTIONS (CLAIMS 1-20):**

Original claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Schmidt (“Wrapper Facade – A Structural Pattern for Encapsulating Functions within Classes”). Original claims 2-4, 7-9, 12-14 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt. Original claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,732,270 (Foody et al.). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse such alleged unpatentability and request reconsideration of claims 1-20.

Original claim 1 sets forth a system for providing object to object communication, including means for identifying at least two objects from a plurality of objects to communicate, means for locating the at least two objects to communicate, and means for using a component framework to enable the communication of the at least two objects. As depicted in Figures 2 and 3 and described in the subject application’s

specification (see pg. 9, line 17 – pg. 10, line 7), a component framework exists among multiple servers, each containing a number of respective components that need to communicate.

The March 11, 2004 Office Action cites Schmidt (“Wrapper Facade – A Structural Pattern for Encapsulating Functions within Classes”) and alleges that such reference discloses all the features of original claim 1. However, there are several fundamental differences between the low-level functionality of the technology disclosed in Schmidt and the system set forth in original claim 1. Original claim 1 sets forth a system for providing object to object communication using a component framework environment. As mentioned above, such communication in the system of claim 1 exists across multiple distinct servers. The technology of Schmidt, however, concerns a client-server based communication system and deals with communication among different peripheral components linked through a single central server.

Based on the above distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that Schmidt fails to disclose every element set forth in original claim 1, specifically the means for using a component framework to enable the communication of at least two objects. As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance and acknowledgement of the same is earnestly solicited. Furthermore, since claims 2-5 depend from otherwise allowable claim 1 and further limit same, claims 2-5 should also be allowed.

The above characterization of the differences between claim 1 and the technology of Schmidt can be similarly applied to independent claims 6, 11 and 16. Furthermore, since 7-10, 12-15 and 17-20 respectively and variously depend from such otherwise allowable independent claims 6, 11 and 16 and further limit same, all claims 6-20 should be allowed.

## **CONCLUSION:**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at last the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-20, is in complete condition for issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance, and action to such

effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at his convenience should only minor issues remain after consideration of this response in order to permit early resolution of same.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING,  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, P.A.

Date: September 13, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard M. Moose", written over a horizontal line.

RICHARD M. MOOSE

Reg. No.: 31,226

Customer ID No.: 22827

Telephone: (864) 271-1592

Facsimile: (864) 233-7342